

REMARKS

Response to Advisory Action

In the Advisory Action mailed March 25, 2010, the Examiner stated that the response filed March 18, 2010 would not be entered because it raised new issues that required further search or consideration. Accordingly, Applicant has filed a Request for Continued Examination so that the response can be entered and considered. The Examiner also noted that the March 18 amendment to Claim 1 would render it indefinite under 35 USC §112 due to improper antecedent basis for the term “said occlusion member.” Applicant has amended Claim 1 to correct this issue.

Rejoinder of Claims 5 and 7

As discussed in the previous responses, Applicant continues to request that method Claims 5 and 7 be rejoined when Claim 1 is found patentable, as they have been amended to share all the structural limitations of this product claim.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that entry of the previous amendments and the current amendments place the case in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned collect at (415) 705-6377 if there are any outstanding issues or questions which can be resolved to allow this application to be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Date: April 19, 2010

By: /Todd A. Noah
Todd A. Noah
Reg. No. 35,626